

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 are currently pending in the subject application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, 9-12, 16-17, and 20 are amended, claims 6 and 19 are canceled, claims 21, 22, and 23 are added, and claims 1-5, 7-18, and 20-23 are presented to the Examiner for further consideration on the merits.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed July 7, 2003.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of applicants' Information Disclosure Statement filed November 20, 2003.

A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention; rejected claims 9, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1-6 and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Key Agreement in ad hoc Networks", Computer Communications, Volume 23, Number 17, 1 November 2000 to Asokan et al. (hereinafter referred to as "the Asokan et al. reference"); and rejected claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Asokan et al. reference in further view of "Applied Cryptography" second edition, 1996 to Schneier (hereinafter referred to as "the Schneier reference").

These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

B. Asserted Indefiniteness Rejections of Claims 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is traversed as to claim 19 as it is canceled.

Claims 5 and 16 now recite a -- key distribution center function -- instead of a “function of key distribution center.” Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 17 and 18 recite a first group key [LSK], while the main wireless terminal functions as a key distribution center [KDC] by distributing first and second group keys. Thus, these limitations are clearly not intended to be the same. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 18, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

C. Rejection of Claims 9, 10, and 11 as Non-Statutory

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the specification’s definition of computer readable media as encompassing carrier waves. Claims 9, 10, and 11 are now limited to tangible computer media and the specification’s definition of such media no longer includes carrier waves. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

D. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-19

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Asokan et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is traversed as to claims 6 and 19 as they are canceled.

Independent claims 1 and 12 now recite the concept of modifying the second group key in the main wireless terminal according to a modification time period, predetermined in the main wireless terminal. This element finds support in the specification on the first line of page 10. In contrast, as described by the Examiner, the Asokan et al. reference needs to update the session key when the composition of the group changes, as stated on page 20 in the fourth paragraph. Thus, the Asokan et al. reference does not have a modification time period, predetermined in the main wireless terminal, but instead updates its session key based upon an external variable, viz., the composition of a dynamic group.

The Asokan et al. reference indicates it is preferable to use a fresh keypair for each run of the protocol, as stated on page 7 in the third paragraph. As keypairs are used to generate session keys, this implies that a session key is used for only one communication session and then discarded. The length of a communication session is not predetermined in the main wireless terminal but instead depends upon the duration of the meeting, i.e., an external variable. Thus, the Asokan et al. reference neither teaches nor suggests the concept of modifying a second group key according to a modification time period, predetermined in the main wireless terminal, but instead modifies session keys based upon group activity. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Asokan et al. reference.

Claims 2-5 and 8-11 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. Hence, claims 2-5 and 8-11 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim, namely independent claim 1, which includes allowable subject matter not found in the references of record. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Asokan et al. reference.

Claims 13-18 ultimately depend from independent claim 12. Hence, claims 13-18 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim, namely independent claim 12, which includes allowable subject matter not found in the references of record. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Asokan et al. reference.

E. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7 and 20

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Asokan et al. reference further in view of the Schneier reference.

Claim 7 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. Hence, claim 7 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim, namely independent claim 1, which includes allowable subject matter not found in the references of record. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Asokan et al. and Schneier references.

Claim 20 ultimately depends from independent claim 12. Hence, claim 20 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim, namely independent claim 12, which includes allowable subject matter not found in the references of record. Accordingly, applicants

respectfully request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Asokan et al. and Schneier references.

F. New Claims 21-23

Claims 21-23 are added by the instant amendment. No new matter is added. Support for these claims may be found in the application as originally filed, for example, on page 11 in paragraph [0028]. Applicants respectfully request entry and examination of new claims 21-23.

G. Conclusion

The remaining documents cited by the Examiner were not relied on to reject the claims. Therefore, no comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: January 3, 2007


Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 500
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042
703.207.0008 TEL
703.207.0003 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.